DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 233 425 CS 504 364

AUTHOR Hochheimer, John L.
TITLE An Ethical Perspective to Communication Research.
PUB DATE May 83
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association (Dallas, TX, May 26-30, 1983).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Communication Research; *Community Involvement; Ethical Instruction; *Ethics; Higher Education; *Scientific Methodology; *Social Science Research; *Social Scientists; Surveys
IDENTIFIERS *Researcher Subject Relationship

ABSTRACT

Despite widespread indifference or resistence to the idea, communication scientists need to discuss the ethical implications of their research. Fortunate in being able to conduct research, scientists are responsible to and for the larger population in whose names they do their work. They need to realize that such traditional research areas and techniques as the mass sample survey, persuasion studies, and attitude/behavior change campaigns, in treating subjects as objects rather than partners in their work, can create a fundamental power imbalance between scientists and nonscientists. To renew public trust in research, scientists must create a more ethical research paradigm reflecting community needs and interests and substituting what Margaret Mead called "informed consent" for voluntary participation among subjects. Discussion of ethical dilemmas in social research must begin in graduate school with a compulsory course addressing, among other issues, the nature of scientists' rights and responsibilities, the role of the general public in research design, and present ethical problems and their possible solutions. (MM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED233425

AN ETHICAL PERSPECTIVE TO COMMUNICATION RESEARCH

by

John L. Hochheimer
Institute for Communication Research
Stanford University
Stanford, Ca. 94305

Paper presented at the annual conference of the

International Communication Association

Dallas, Texas
May, 1983

ABSTRACT

Despite widespread indifference and/or widespread hostility to the idea, there is a great need for the discussion of ethical implications of communication research. Scientists are fortunate to be able to do the work they do; consequently they are responsible to and for the larger population in whose names research is conducted. Much communication research reflects a fundamental power imbalance between scientists and "subjects" which may have unethical implications. A more ethical research paradigm would renew public trust in science and may also yield more fruitful research findings. The proper place to begin discussion of ethical dilemmas of social research is in the graduate curriculum. Ultimately, the ethical foundation of research is the individual conscience of the scientist.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
John L. Hochheimer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

I would like to thank Ramesh Balakrishnan, Bryce McIntyre, Abe Nosnik, and Hulda Nystrom for their comments and assistance on previous drafts of this paper.

CS 504364

An Ethical Perspective to Communication Research

> The ethical philosopher ... whenever he ventures to say which course of action is the best, is on no essentially different level from the common man. "See, I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil; therefore, choose life that thou and thy seed may live"--when this challenge comes to us, it is simply our total character and personal genius that are on trial; and if we invoke any so-called philosophy, our choice and use of that also are but revelations of our personal aptitude or incapacity for moral life. From this unsparing practical ordeal no professor's lectures and no array of books can save us. The solving word, for the learned and the unlearned man alike, lies in the last resort in the dumb willingnesses and unwillingnesses of their interior characters, and nowhere else. It is not in heaven, neither is it beyond the sea; but the word is very nigh unto thee, in thy mouth and in thy heart, that thou mayest do it.
>
> William James[1]

This paper seeks to pry open a particularly sensitive can of worms: that there are ethical dimensions to communication research and that we have overlooked or disregarded these dimensions in the design and conduct of that research. It is a subject that is, to some scholars, one better left alone; to others, its introduction into scientific discourse elicits tales of somewhat less than honorable episodes either witnessed or reported through years of teaching and research; while to some others, problems of ethics and values have no place in science.[2] Requests for its discussion frequently have been met with disdain and, in some cases, outright hostility.[3]

Yet, ethics is a subject that is critical, for both scientific and practical reasons. Value judgments are integral parts of scientific research and, therefore, must be explicitly acknowledged by the scholar when conducting his/her work.[4] In practical terms, a self-conscious examination of the ethical base upon which our

science is built may restore the mutual sense of trust[5] between scientist and society that appears to be eroding in the current political climate.[6]

A complete survey of the ethical dimensions of science could easily fill several books. One way to divide the discussion would be to separate the three dimensions of the ethics between scientists and the general public.[7] An ethical approach to teaching, for example, suggests that the teacher not use his/her position to indoctrinate students so that they will merely parrot the instructor's ideas.[8] Ethics between colleagues covers such issues as fraud (a.k.a. "fudging" data), suppression of data that contradicts previous findings, and a variety of interpersonal political issues (e.g., using the tenure process to suppress unpopular ideas, non-uniform standards in judging publication in refereed journals, allegations of lack of expertise among members of human subjects committees, etc.).[9] Ethical relations between scientists and the general public cover such issues as moral dimensions of the use of human subjects for research, [10] or deception of research subjects,[11] and the use of scientific results in policy making, i.e., the social, political, and economic impact of applied scientific knowledge on society.

In each of these perspectives, however, lie the underlying dimensions of trust, power and responsibility. The student trusts that the teacher will give as complete a representation of the facts as s/he is able, although the teacher has the power to present a biased view of the subject as if this were the only reasonable position;[12] scientists trust that data presented in research

papers were gathered in as objective conditions as possible, and they assume that their colleagues will be equally honest; the public, generally, believes that scientists attain new insights into the nature of things for mutually beneficial purposes. It is primarily because the latter condition has held for many years that scientists have been given the relatively free position of professional tenure with academic freedom.[13] But it is also because scientists have relatively unqualified freedom to do their work that they have concomitant responsibilities to and for the people on whose behalf the research is being conducted. And this implies that the relationship between scientist and society be one of mutual trust and respect. That is the focus of this paper.

The Social Scientist and Society

Few would reject the notion that the primary purpose of any social science as a science is to increase the understanding of the human experience. We study man and woman so that we can know them better and, perhaps, anticipate some of their behaviors in a variety of conditions. For some scholars, this understanding is an end in itself; for others, social conditions are studied in order to understand, and perhaps ameliorate, the causes or conditions of suffering, pain, injustice, inequality, etc.[14] When we act to apply some of the knowledge we have learned, we usually intend to improve some aspect of the human condition.[15]

The people who get to do this kind of work for a living are not drawn randomly from the population, however. While there

are many thousands of people conducting these endeavors around the world, they come from a uniquely fortunate segment of society. This segment is allowed by society-at-large to do scientific research; no individual has divine mandate to do this work. S/he is given a relatively free hand to devote his/her professional life to an occupation of interest more as the result of good fortune than of any other factor.

We are lucky to be able to do what we want to do and get paid for it. The intellectual capabilities we have at our command, which enable us to choose to do this work, are gifts to us. The training that we have received also results from the confluence of fortuitous circumstances: we were born and raised in the right time and society, money was provided, our societies had no competing claims for our talents, etc. Very few people in any culture have ever been given the opportunities we so often take as naturally ours.

Because we have the option of doing the work that most people can never do, and because this work requires the cooperation of those same people who have little access or understanding of social science, we have responsibilities both to and for them. We conduct our inquiries, discern the nature of human existence, pass judgment about how and why human beings live the lives they do and expect to have our judgments accepted in the greater world of public opinion. We, the scientists, act in the name of all mankind; it is to mankind that we are ultimately responsible.

The issue of ethics, then, is not whether or how science can be "value-free." The issue is that some human beings are in

the fortuitous position of studying other human beings professionally. Although some scholars contend that we should be removed from the people that we study, we cannot be. We are always a part of the objects of our scrutiny. We are both "in this world and of it,"[16] and are therefore as much the proper people to be studied as anyone else in the greater population.

Social Research as Power Imbalance

Yet, due in part to its administrative origins (stemming from the influence of positivistic requirements for scientific knowledge claims), communication researchers have tried to separate themselves from their fellow human beings, treating people as objects, rather than as partners in a mutual quest for better human understanding. The treatment of people as objects reflects an inequitable power relationship between scientist and non-scientist.[18] It is a view that posits people as guinea pigs, caged animals that must be "experimented on," through deception if necessary, because, it is felt, they do not have the level of scientific sophistication that scientists do.[19] The scientist, in this view, is seen as coldly detached from the concerns of the world, one who seeks information for sinister purposes.

Under this rubric fall such traditional areas and techniques of communication research as the mass sample survey, persuasion research, and attitude/behavior change campaigns. In the large survey, people are seen as interchangeable "subjects" who are important for their statistical equivalence, not for their individuality.[20] The survey has its foundation in early marketing

research,[21] and its application in early political communication studies.[22] Both of these traditions shared an elitist bias that there was an "ideal citizen" (either 'consumer' or 'voter') against whom the behavior of groups of individuals was being measured.[23]

In persuasion research, the scientist studies the conditions under which people yield most readily to persuasive messages in "situations where behavior has been modified by symbolic transactions (messages) which are sometimes, but not always, linked with coercive force (indirectly coercive) and which appeal to the reason and emotion(s) of the person(s) being persuaded."[24] This, of course, still implies a fundamental power imbalance between those creating the messages and those who are meant to be persuaded.[25]

The problem of imbalance of power between scientists and non-scientists becomes central when seen in the context of attitude/behavioral change campaigns. Here the focus is on using principles derived from communication and social psychological research to influence the ways in which people live. The outcomes of the campaigns are so manifestly positive (to the researchers) that little, if any, consideration is given to possible ethical problems. Zimbardo and Ebbesen, for example, avoid "any editorializing about the moral or ethical value of any...practical approaches to changing attitudes and behavior. They exist in our lives and are in constant use, to the advantage of some and to the possible detriment of others. Those who object to these methods must first understand how and why they are so effective." They then ask: "Is it unethical to want people to brush their teeth or use mouthwash?"[26] Even if all behavior change campaigns were as apparently benign, this is the sort of question an

exasperated parent asks of a child, a situation in which, ipso facto, there is an overt imbalance of power. In another example, the present author maintains that "it is possible for people to consciously choose to change their behaviors if they are effectively educated,"[27] but that the planning of the intervention be conducted by "research-oriented behavioral and social scientists, evaluation planners, and those experienced in working with the media and community organizations."[28]

Little, if any, consideration is given to consultation with those who ostensibly be helped in the implementation of the research. They are seen to be too poorly expert in planning or the conduct of science to be of much help. We think we know better than the people (upon whom we wish to impart the fruits of our learning) how they can best live their lives. As we have seen, this has too frequently led to tragic results, especially in the field of communication and development.[28a] To provide people with access to decision-making is seen by some as a means of politicizing science. This view persists despite evidence suggesting that public participation in scientific oversight and planning committees provides a sense of two-way communication between scientists and the local community, and provides scientists with problems and solutions that they (the scientists) had not anticipated.[29]

This is a view of social science as a means of manipulation through power imbalance (requiring deception if necessary) to implement experiments of "subjects." Many scientists implicitly understand that such a power imbalance exists. Evidence for this is suggested by two reports, separated by more than 25 years, of social research conducted on social researchers. The first describes the

hostile reaction to a survey (conducted by Paul Lazarsfeld) of 2,500 academic social scientists about the issues of academic freedom and their fears for its possible danger. When the researchers went into the field, according to David Riesman:

> "Even the careful specifications given the interviewers could not guard against often violent reactions by respondents...At a number of colleges and universities, the interviewers could hardly have been received with more uneasiness and hostility had they been immigration agents asking in an immigration slum about citizenship. While such abrasive encounters were, overall, in the minority, their occurrence nevertheless sheds light on the interplay of a sensitive issue, academic respondents and nonacademic interviewers... Not all social scientists, and assuredly not all academicians, are willing respondents in the best of cases--as anyone can discover who seeks to do research on a college campus; and not even the practitioners are immune to ambivalence toward the scientific method, when it comes close to home."[30]

The second example comes from the current dissertation work being done by Marjorie Fish at the University of Texas. Fish conducted a survey of communication scholars to ascertain the influences and direction of their work. She, too, met with considerable hostility from her colleagues, who resented her intrusion into the privacy of their professional lives.[31]

We expect that other people should cooperate in an enterprise that many of us prefer not to, in part, because we understand the manipulative nature of survey research and, in part, because we resent the lack of control that being the "subject" of research makes us. This comes as the result of the values of the scientists' relations with non-scientists that have been inculcated in generations of graduate students.[32]

An Ethical Alternative

The alternative approach to the conduct of social science is to see non-scientists as partners in a mutual adventure into the unknown.

Most people are as interested in how the world works as are the people who professionally seek to know, and they would be willing partners in the quest for knowledge. Mutual respect means trust, empathy in two directions, a 'quid pro quo' relationship. It means that scientists recognize that they are a part of what they study, and that the knowledge gained from research is beneficial, as both scientific and general information.

Partnership in research means co-participation in the planning of research and of research instruments. Questions for surveys, for example, would reflect the needs and interests of both parties. What do people in a community want to know about each other that can best be ascertained through large-sample survey research?[33] How can the tools of the social scientist be put at the disposal of the community into which s/he wants to go for his/her purposes? What questions can representatives of the community (<u>not</u>, necessarily, "leaders" who may represent nothing more than their own economic clout or self-interest) suggest that may not be readily apparent within the offices of a research institution? How can people in the local community call upon the strengths of interpersonal networks that already exist to assist the social researcher?

From this perspective, deception becomes unnecessary. People are a lot more honest and intelligent than many politicians, policy planners, and social researchers give them credit for. Many people would honestly and eagerly assist if given the opportunity to be drawn into the confidence of scientists, rather than being treated as research objects who must be coerced into compliance. Margaret Mead describes an anthropological model for research that substitutes

voluntary participation for "informed consent" as a necessary precondition for ethical research work.[34] Some of the "sense-making" research being done 'with' (rather than 'on') patients has yielded not only greater trust between doctor and patient, but also has been shown to provide better research findings than had previously been attained in this area.[35]

The outcomes of participant research go in several beneficial directions. First, we maintain (or regain) the trust of the larger community that has been the subject of years of academic, governmental, and industrial research that has intruded into their lives. We recreate a sense of mutuality of purpose; both scientist and participant seeks to better understand the human experience and ways in which it can be improved. Secondly, given a new climate of trust and mutual respect, we will most likely discover new dimensions of how people perceive the world and behave, since they will now have less reason to fear manipulation by scientists. And, we may also discover new perspectives to the human experience that could not be anticipated in the worlds of academia and government, which are never as heterogeneous as the population at large.

This alternative approach does have some attendant consequences. There are several epistemological issues that become readily apparent: the methodological problems of internal and external validity, self-reports, selective perception, retention and deception of participants in our research cannot be solved solved solely on ethical grounds. These are epistemological questions and need further conceptualization and empirical testing. The problems need to be

worked upon. Although there is no inherent incommensurability between ethical and epistemological problems, we should proceed cautiously. Since the balance of power, for now, resides with the researcher, conflicts between ethical and epistemological dimensions of science should have greater weight given to the ethical problems. Studies can always be done later once the ethical issues had been adequately addressed; "no harm, no foul," as they say.

Discussion

These are issues that are always with us; they can never be settled for all time. A handbook of "Ethical Principles in the Conduct of Research with Human Participants"[36] becomes outdated with its publication, since human experience advances between the time the last advisory committee issues its report and the book becomes publicly available.[37] In this sense, ethical dimensions are no different from other dimensions of science. "There can be no final truth in ethics any more than in physics, until the last man has had his experience and has had his say."[38] With experience, we can refine our perspectives on the ethical dimensions of communication research, but we will never reach an end point.

We know this to be true for the theory, methods, and statistical procedures we employ. We build on the past to plan, theorize about, and study the present. Each new ethical problem produces new perspectives to old questions: What are the most worthwhile ways to interact with people whom we study? What possible conflicts of interest arise when we become both student and teacher? Both observer and observed? Implementer of social policy and respector of human

dignity?

Answers to these questions cannot be codified. We can learn from our past experiences, both good ones as well as regrettable mistakes, in order to guide our research. The proper place to begin the discussion of some of the problems, solutions, and enigmas of research is in the graduate curriculum. This is the place where we first expose new scholars to the triumphs and pitfalls of the past. This should also be the place where young scholars confront some of the inevitable ethical dilemmas that have been, and will be, confronted in the conduct of research with human beings.

These cannot be adequately covered in a single chapter in a methods textbook, nor can they be fully addressed during one class session of a graduate methods course (two typical cases). There must be a compulsory course for graduate social science students (perhaps an inter-disciplinary series of colloquia) addressing:

1. Who are we to be doing the work that we do?
2. What are our rights and responsibilities? To whom?
3. What problems ahve been confronted in the past? Why?
4. How have researchers dealt with past ethical dilemmas? What are some currently intractable issues?
5. What is/has been the role of the general public in policy-making and the design of research?
6. How might we seek possible solutions?

The proper time for such a course in the academic sequence should probably be after the young scholar has had some research experience, i.e., at least after one year of graduate work.[39] This should probably be supplemented by an annual panel on ethical problems encountered

during the previous year as a regular part of research conferences. In these ways the ethical dimensions of science become active parts of the research process.

Conclusion

Ultimately, decisions about the ethical conduct of scientific inquiry must be made by individual scholars; these cannot be covered adequately by textbooks or lectures on the subject. The responsibility for science comes from the individual conscience of the scholar. In an atmosphere of trust and respect for all people (including ourselves) we create a more ethical social science. We suffer from poorly conceived research, and we prosper, both as scientists and as human beings, in a social science sensitive to human concerns.

Thus, a more ethical communication research can help us to understand the human condition in better ways. Building upon these, we can help to create a more trusting society. The source for our ethical actions must be ourselves, both individually and collectively. "it is not in heaven, neither is it beyond the sea; but the word is very nigh unto thee, in thy mouth and in thy heart, that thou mayest do it."

FOOTNOTES

1. William James (1891) "The Moral Philosopher and the Moral Life." In John D. McDermott (Ed.), The Writings of William James, 1977 edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

2. This view has engendered many fierce rebuttals across the sciences: James, ibid.,
   J. Bronowski (1965) Science and Human Values. New York: Harper Colophon Books. See especially pp. 49-76;
   Wolfgang Koehler (1966) The Place of Values in a World of Facts. New York: Liveright Publishing Co.;
   Margeret Mead (1970) "Research with Human Beings: A Model Derived from Anthropological Field Practice." In Paul A. Freund (Ed.), Experimentation with Human Subjects. New York: George Braziller, pp. 152-177;
   Bertrand Russell (1961) "Science and Human Life." In Robert E. Egner and Lester E. Donovan (Eds.), The Basic Writings of Bertrand Russell. New York: George Allen and Unwin, pp. 716-725; and
   Max Weber (1922) "Science as a Vocation." In H.H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (Eds.), From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology. New York: Oxford University Press (1958), pp. 49-76.

3. Cited in Max C. Otto (1949) Science and the Moral Life. New York: Mentor Books. See pp. 71-89.

4. Hans Jonas (1970) "Philosophical Reflections on Experimentation with Human Subjects." In Freund, op. cit., pp. 1-31; Bronowski, op. cit., pp. 1-24.

5. In Mead's terms. See Mead, op. cit.

6. See, for example, Issac Asimov (1980) "Science, Public Must Be Friends if the World is to Survive." Los Angeles Times, Aug. 28; Lewis Thomas (1981) "On the Nature of Co-Operation." Discover, 2: 58-59.

7. These are intersubjective dimensions of scientific ethics. Yet another dimension is the role that values play in the process of constructing our conjectures about reality. In this dimension, there can be no meaningful "science" without making value judgments about the importance and meaningfulness of what we study. Any claims to a "value-free" science are absurd on their face. See Robert S. Lynd (1939 in 1964) Knowledge For What? New York: Grove Press, p. 183; also Bronowski, op. cit., Koehler, op. cit.; Otto, op. cit.

8. Martin Diamond (1977) "Teaching About Politics as a Vocation." In Sidney Hook, Paul Kurtz and Milo Todorovich (Eds.), The Ethics of Teaching and Scientific Research. Buffalo, N.Y.: Prometheus Books, pp. 3-22;

Charles Frankel (1977) "Facts, Values and Responsible Choice." In Hook, et. al., op. cit., pp. 23-28;
Fred Baumann (1977) "Objectivity and Indoctrination." In Hook, et al., op. cit., pp. 53-59;
Robert M. Rosenzweig (1977) "Faculty and Standards of Ethical Conduct." In Hook, et. al., op. cit., pp. 73-82;
Max Weber, op. cit., pp. 129-156.

9. John L. Horn (1977) "The Ethics of Research: A Case History and Its Lessons." In Hook, et al., op. cit., pp. 135-159;
See also Bronowski, op. cit.

10. Paul Davidson Reynolds (1979) Ethical Dilemmas and Social Science Research. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

11. Sissela Bok (1978) Lying: Moral Choice in Public and Private Life. New York: Vintage Books, pp. 192-213 "Deceptive Social Science Research."
Herbert Kelman (1967) "Human Use of Human Subjects: The Problem of Deception in Social Psychological Experiments. Psychological Bulletin, 67: 1-11.
See also Mead, op. cit.; Reynolds, op. cit.

12. "To the prophet and the demagogue, it is said: 'Go your ways out into the streets and speak openly to the world,' that is, speak where criticism is possible. In the lecture room we stand opposite our audience, and it has to remain silent. I deem it irresponsible to exploit the circumstance that for the sake of their career the students have to attend a teacher's course while there is nobody present to oppose him with criticism. The task of the teacher is to serve the students with his knowledge and scientific experience and not imprint upon them his personal political views."
Weber, op. cit., p. 146.

13. Sidney Hook (1977) "Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibilities." In Hook, et al., op cit., pp. 117-123.

14. "There would be no social sciences if there were not perplexities in living in culture that call for solution. And it is precisely the role of the social sciences to be troublesome, to disconcert the habitual arrangements by which we manage to live along, and to demonstrate the possibility of change in more adequate directions."
Lynd, op. cit., p. 181.

15. Otto, op. cit., pp. 153-170: "Scientific Humanism."

15. Julian Huxley has written in Scientific Research and Social Needs:

> "Personally, I know that looking at science in relation to social needs, as I have had to do for this survey, has cleared my own mind a great deal; and if the scientific movement in this country can do this and become conscious of itself, and of its limitations, and of its relation to the economic driving forces of society, that will be a very valuable step. The chief moral..., is that science is not the disembodied sort of activity that some people would make out, engaged on the abstract task of pursuing universal truth, but a social function intimately linked up with human history and human destiny. And the sooner scientists as a body realize this and organize their activities on that basis, the better both for science and for society."
> Cited in Otto, op. cit, p. 102.

17. Ibid., pp. 90-109. See also Koehler, pp. 38-58.

18. Todd Gitlin (1981) "Media Sociology: The Dominant Paradigm." In G. Cleveland Wilhoit and Harold de Bock (Eds.), Mass Communication Review Yearbook, Vol. 2. Beverly Hills, Ca.: Sage Publications, pp. 93-101.

19. Mead, op. cit., pp. 158-160.

20. This view is a construct which was created for the convenience of the researcher, not the individual being studied.

21. Gitlin, op. cit., pp. 73-121.

22. Steven Chaffee and John Hochheimer (1983, in press) "The Beginnings of Political Communication Research in the United States: Origins of the Limted Effects Model." In Everett M. Rogers and Francis Balle (Eds.), New Media in Western Europe and America. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Publishing Corp.

23. Ibid.

24. Gerald R. Miller (1980) "On Being Persuaded: Some Basic Disctinctions." In Michael E. Roloff and Gerald R. Miller (Eds.), Persuasion: New Directions in Theory and Research. Beverly Hills, Ca.: Sage Publications, p. 15.

25. Realization of this power imbalance may be a reason why there had been a decline in the number of persuasion studies conducted in the 1970's when compared with previous decades. Roloff and Miller, op. cit., p. 7.

26. Philip Zimbardo and Ebbe B. Ebbesen (1970) Influencing Attitudes and Changing Behavior. Reading, Ma.: Addison-Wesley Publishing, p. 113.

27. John L. Hochheimer (1981) "Reducing Alcohol Abuse: A Critical Review of Educational Strategies." In Mark H. Moore and Dean R. Gerstein (Eds.), Alcohol Abuse and Public Policy: Beyond the Shadow of Prohibition. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, p. 287.

28. Ibid., p. 327; See also Harold Mendelsohn (1973) "Some Reasons Why Public Information Campaigns Can Succeed." Public Opinion Quarterly, 37: 50-61.

29. Diana B. Dutton and John L. Hochheimer (1982) "Institutional Biosafety Committees and Public Participation: Assessing an Experiment." Nature, 297: 11-15.

30. David Riesman (1957) "Interviewers, Elites, and Academic Freedom." In David Riesman, Abundance for What? And Other Essays. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Co. (1964), pp. 568-569.

31. Personal remarks concerning her dissertation: Marjorie Fish (in progress) "A Study of the Sociology of Academic Mass Communications." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Radio-TV-Film, University of Texas.

32. Bok, op. cit. See Chapter XIII: "Deceptive Social Science Research." The Issue of scientific decpetion of people being studied is also a central issue here. We do not trust people to be truthful unless we catch them in the acts of being themselves without their knowledge. At their roots, both the issues of manipulation and deception imply power imbalances between scientists and non-scientists.

33. True participation differs from the use of "focus groups" in that participation is a voluntary interaction for mutual benefit, whereas focus groups are directed by the researcher to fulfill the ends the researcher requires.

34. Mead, op. cit., pp. 152-155.

35. Brenda Dervin, Michael S. Nilan, and Thomas L. Jacobson (1982) "Improving Predictions of Information Use: A Comparison of Predictor Types in a Health Communication Setting." In Michael Burgoon (Ed.), Communication Yearbook 5. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Books.
Brenda Dervin, Sylvia Harlock, Rita Atwood, and Carol Garzona (1980) "The Human Side of Information: An Exploration in a Health Communication Context." In Dan Nimmo (Ed.), Communication Yearbook IV. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Books.

36. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association (1973).

37. Indeed, the first revision, "Ethical Standards for Psychologists," was published four years later.

38. James, op. cit., p. 611.

39. Stanford University, for example, has courses in ethics in its law, medical, and business schools, but none for its social science graduate students (except one in ethical issues in educational research). When asked why there was no such course in the School of Humanities and Sciences, a faculty member (now on the Stanford Human Subjects Review Committee) replied: "You can't expect doctoral students to take courses in philosophy." One wonders what, then, do the letters "Ph.D." stand for? This same situation and attitude are probably true for most research universities.

Addendum

28a. Luis Ramiro Beltran S. (1976) "Alien Premises, Objects, and Methods in Latin American Communication Research." In Everett M. Rogers (Ed.), Communication and Development: Critical Perspectives. Beverly Hills, Ca.: Sage Publications, pp. 15-42.